

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed February 28, 2003 (Paper No. 7), the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harris (US Patent Number 5,339,362). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-17 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of Kadnier (US Patent Number 6,097,520), Haubner (US Patent Number 5,559,499), and the Applicant's admitted prior art. Also, the Examiner rejected Claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with which the Applicant regards as the invention. Moreover, the Examiner objected to Claims 12-17 of the pending application as being of improper form for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. By this paper, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9, and 12-13 to distinguish the art of record and reconsideration of the above captioned application including the remaining claims is now requested in light of the amendment and remarks contained herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 12 of the pending application as being of improper form for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. However, the Applicant notes that Claim 12 has been amended to include infrared control signals so as to further limit the subject matter of the previous Claim 9. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of amended Claim 12 and its dependencies of Claims 13-17 with allowance of the same. In addition, the Examiner rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with which the Applicant regards as the invention. However, the Applicant notes that Claim 13 has been amended to include antecedent reference to the interface device so as to distinctly claim the subject matter of the previous Claim 9. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of amended Claim 13 and its dependencies of Claims 14-17 with allowance of the same.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 of the pending application as being anticipated by Harris '362. However, after careful review, the Harris reference fails to disclose coupling a stereo control interface device to the original local hardwired stereo controls, such as OEM steering wheel mounted stereo controls, so as to control the replacement stereo system

remotely therefrom. Advantageously, the Applicant's interface device as claimed in Claim 1 allows for remote control of a replacement stereo system from originally installed local stereo controls that are hardwired into a component of the vehicle, such as the steering wheel. In addition, the Applicant's interface device further provides a means for using a wireless control signal to control the replacement stereo from the originally installed local stereo controls.

In contrast, Harris discloses (column 19, lines 37-40) that, in a preferred embodiment, the entire stereo system is controlled and adjusted using only the RDAT stereo controller, which interacts from the control module of the replacement stereo system. With the Harris RDAT stereo controller, a user generally interacts directly with the RDAT stereo controller to control the replacement stereo system instead of using originally mounted local stereo controls as disclosed by the Applicant in Claim 1. In fact, after careful review, Harris is primarily concerned with controlling the replacement stereo system with only the RDAT stereo controller provided with the replacement stereo system, which is different in function and scope from the Applicant's disclosed teachings of Claim 1. Moreover, even though Harris discloses (column 3, lines 27-29) that the RDAT stereo controller can be configured to communicate with the replacement stereo system via a hardwired format or wireless format, Harris still fails to disclose or suggest coupling the RDAT stereo controller to originally mounted local stereo controls to control the replacement stereo system as claimed by the Applicant in Claim 1.

Because Harris discloses controlling the replacement stereo system exclusively with the RDAT stereo controller, Harris expressly teaches away from the Applicant's invention as defined by the Applicant in Claim 1. Hence, Harris cannot be said to anticipate the Applicant's invention under 102 or even teach it under 103. Moreover, there is no suggestion to modify Harris to include the Applicant's invention of Claim 1 as a result of Harris teaching away from the Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 as amended is patentable over Harris and respectfully requests reconsideration of Claim 1 including its related dependencies of Claims 2-8 with prompt allowance of the same.

Furthermore, since Harris's device and system is clearly different in function and scope to the Applicant's claimed device and system, there can be no suggestion to modify the Harris structure with the teachings of Kadnier, Haubner, or any other cited prior art to thereby produce

the advantageous results of the Applicant's claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claim 9 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of Kadnier, Haubner, and the Applicant's admitted prior art. After careful review, Kadnier '520 is primarily concerned with a remote control receiver and operation thereof to control appliances in a home. Kadnier neither suggests nor discloses anything related to using originally hardwired local stereo controls mounted within a vehicle to control a replacement stereo receiver via an interface device as claimed by the Applicant in Claim 9. In addition, Haubner '499 also uses a receiver for the reception of wirelessly transmitted information and fails to suggest or disclose the Applicant's claimed invention in Claim 9. Even if there was a suggestion to modify Harris with Kadnier or Haubner, the resulting combination would still fail to teach the Applicant's claimed invention as defined by Claim 9. Thus, the Applicant submits that Claim 9 as amended is patentable over Harris in view of Kadnier, Haubner, or any other cited reference and respectfully requests reconsideration of Claim 9 including its related dependencies of Claims 10-17 with prompt allowance of the same.

SUMMARY

From the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and the Applicant requests the prompt allowance of the same. In light of the above discussion, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of amended Claims 1, 9, and 12-13 and reconsideration of the remaining claims 2-8, 10-11, and 14-17, which further define patentable subject matter and are allowable due to their dependencies on amended Claims 1, 9, and 12-13, respectively. The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the application in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5/27/03

By: 

Michael H. Trenholm
Registration No. 37,743
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(909) 781-9231